THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED · BY · CONGRESS · MAY · 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

June 28, 1985

AM
10:00 CONVENE, 708 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C.

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of the May 15, 1985 minutes of the Commission of Fine Arts.

B. Dates of next meetings: July 31, 1985, Wednesday
September 11, 1985, Wednesday

C. Publication of Brief History, 1984 edition, report.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council & Department of Interior

CFA 28/JUN/85-1, U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, between 14th and 15th Streets, south of the Main Auditors Building, revised drawings.

B. National Park Service, Department of Interior

CFA 28/JUN/85-2, Georgetown Waterfront Park, Phase I, between the Potomac River and K Street and Wisconsin Avenue and 31st Street, N.W., final working drawings and landscape plans.

C. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

CFA 28/JUN/85-4, "Lone Sailor" at the Navy Memorial, Pennsylvania Avenue and 8th Street, N.W.

D. Department of the Army

1. CFA 28/JUN/85-5, Administrative Building, Fort Myer, VA.

2. CFA 28/JUN/85-6, Bowling Center, Ft. Myer, VA.

AM
11:30 E. District of Columbia Government, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

Old Georgetown Act

1. O.G. 85-162, 2809 P Street, N.W., Proposed new dwelling, final working drawings.

2. O.G. 85-166, 1000 29th Street, N.W., Proposed new apartment building, revised concept designs.

3. O.G. 85-186 & 187, 3222-3270 M Street, N.W., Georgetown Park Phase II, final working drawings and material samples.

4. O.G. 85-188, 3276 M Street, N.W., Market building renovation, final working drawings.

5. O.G. 85-197, 907 & 909 30th Street, N.W., Rosewood Hotel and office building, final working drawings.

Appendix I.

Shipstead-Luce Act

1. S.L. 85-65, 3004 Oregon Knolls Drive, N.W., Proposed new dwelling.

2. S.L. 85-66, 3027 Oregon Knolls Drive, N.W., Proposed new dwelling.

3. S.L. 85-70, 425 2nd Street, N.E., New office building, concept.

4. S.L. 85-72, 2929 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Renovations and additions, concept.

Appendix II.

F. Committee on House Administration, House of Representatives

1. CFA 28/JUN/85-7, H.J. Res. 142, a bill "To authorize the Black Revolutionary War Patriots Foundation to establish

a monument in the District of Columbia, at an appropriate site in Constitution Gardens."

2. CFA 28/JUN/85-8, H.R. 2205, a bill "To erect a memorial on Federal land in the District of Columbia or its environs to honor members of the Armed Forces of the United States who served in the Korean War."

G. Department of the Treasury, Bureau of the Mint

1. CFA 28/JUN/85-9, Lady Bird Johnson Medal.

2. CFA 28/JUN/85-10, Vietnam Veterans National Medal.

III. INSPECTION

Holocaust Memorial.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNERS	PROJECT
*O.G. 85-70	3240 Reservoir Street, N.W. Aramus Corporation	Condominium: Concept

ACTION: Concept designs for new condominium structure as shown on drawings received and dated 17 May 1985 are approved contingent on resolution of all questions concerning zoning and intended demolition work. Razing application shall be submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts for review and approval showing exact areas proposed for demolition prior to approval of design development drawings. Zoning status shall be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to submission of design development of the above design with particular emphasis addressed to remaining elevations and architectural details.

---

*O.G. 85-136	3001 - 07 M Street, N.W. 3001 M Limited Partnership	Renovation of three historic townhouses: Concept

ACTION: Concept of restoration and alteration is approved for design development. Submit refinements and details of porch enclosure for review and approval prior to final working drawing submission.

O.G. 85-138	1607 28th Street, N.W. Harry Belin	Iron fence

ACTION: Issue permit for iron fence as shown on materials received and dated 2 May 1985.

---

*O.G. 85-142	1001 30th Street, N.W. Crow-Washington Square 1192, Ltd.	New office building

ACTION: Issue permit for new office building. Construction drawings received and dated 3 May 1985 comply with preliminary designs approved November 1984. Erect material sample panel on site for Commission approval prior to construction. Submit for approval final designs for courtyard planter when ready.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
* O.G. 85-145	1000 29th Street, N.W. Matthews-Walde, Inc.	New apartment building

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Design as submitted is of insufficient architectural quality to merit approval. Recommend additional study of design so as to achieve a more appropriate residential character and architectural quality reflecting the importance and public visibility of the site. It is requested that these additional studies be submitted for conceptual review, and not as part of an application for issuance of permit as was the case in this application.

---

* O.G. 85-146	3256 M Street, N.W. Georgetown Park II Associates	Raze one story building

ACTION: Issue permit for razing of one story commercial structure. Existing building does not contribute to historic district and occupies a site already given the Commission's conceptual approval for new development. This action confirms the Commission's previous approval for demolition of this structure dated 25 March 1981 (see O.G. 81-73).

O.G. 85-149	3241 M Street, N.W. Paul Sweeney	Sign-awning

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Request that existing second floor sign be removed, since the design, materials, location on building and advertising copy are not appropriate for signs in the historic district. The Commission staff is available to discuss outher proposals to identify this business.

O.G. 85-151	2917 M Street, N.W. A.L. Wheeler	Sign-awning

ACTION: Issue permit for existing sign-awning as shown on documents dated 17 May 1985.

O.G. 85-152	3125 M Street, N.W. Hamburger Hamlets, Inc.	Sign-awning

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Awnings of this design and at this location on the second floor and interfering with architectural details would be inappropriate to the architectural and historical character of the building.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 85-155	1080 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Georgetown Park Condominium Unit Owner's Association	Sign-awnings

ACTION: Note that there are two awning-signs in different locations and of differing design and material. There is no objection to issuing a permit for the existing Grace Street awning. There is objection to the other. Recommend the removal of the existing Wisconsin Avenue awning which is inappropriate and obscures architectural detail.

O.G. 85-156	3031 O Street, N.W. Courtney Lord	Temporary sign

ACTION: Issue permit for temporary construction sign, identifying architect, not to exceed 180 days, or for the duration of construction, whichever is less.

O.G. 85-158	1621 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Helen McCauly	Signs

ACTION: Note that application includes two signs. Ground-mounted sign has a permit (1962) and does not require further review. No objection to design of horizontal sign mounted on building; however, recommend relocation to area below the window sill of the projecting bay.

O.G. 85-159	1424 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Maison De Fay	Sign

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Recommend removal of existing sign as incompatible with building and that new sign of same size and in same location be applied directly on trim band, either painted on or applied as individual letters.

O.G. 85-160	3208 O Street, N.W. Esther "L"	Sign

ACTION: Issue permit.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNERS	PROJECT
O.G. 85-121	3336 Prospect Street, N.W. Mr. & Mrs. Stanton H. Burnett	Construct timber wall, remove & reinstall existing chain link fence

ACTION: No objection to permit issuance for new retaining wall. Reinstallation of chain link fence is not recommended, consider wood or sapling fence on top of retaining wall.

---

*O.G. 85-148	907-09 30th Street, N.W. Rosewood Hotels, Inc.	New hotel and office building: Conceptual

ACTION: See letter to Carol B. Thompson and letter to Mayor Marion Barry, both dated 24 May 1985.

O.G. 85-150	3513 "N" Street, N.W. Archdiocese of Washington	Restore wall & fence

ACTION: Issue permit for renovation of existing masonry wall and iron fence. (Suggest that existing wall stones be number-coded before removal and reinstalled in same configuration as shown in photographs received and dated 29 May 1985.) Weep-holes shall be incorporated into construction work with drainage to open air.

O.G. 85-161	3249 "O" Street, N.W. Gail Rogers	Residential renovation

ACTION: Issue permit for renovation to existing house as shown on drawings received and dated 17 May 1985. Note changes to drawing which omit application of decorative lintels to street front windows.

O.G. 85-163	1668 33rd Street, N.W. Antony Childs	Renovation and addition

ACTION: Issue permit for alterations as shown on drawing dated 31 May 1985. Profile and alignment of new transom bar shall match that above door and on sides of bay. Beaded mold shall be used on new window. No change on second floor.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNERS	PROJECT
O.G. 85-164	3034 "M" Street, N.W. Hoskinson and Davies	Two, internally-illuminated, plastic signs

ACTION: No objection to existing horizontal flush-mounted sign. Recommend removal of existing internally-illuminated projecting sign as incompatible with character of historic district and exceeds the maximum allowable square footage permitted by the D.C. Building Code sign regulations.

O.G. 85-166	1517 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Alain Chetrit	Commercial renovation

ACTION: No objection to concept design for storefront alterations. Sign-awning as submitted is incompatible with character of historic district. Recommend awning and sign of a more traditional nature in keeping with the design of the proposed alterations to the shop front.

O.G. 85-167	1330 30th Street, N.W. Wynant D. Vanderpool, Jr.	Driveway

ACTION: Issue permit for proposed new curb cut and driveway.

O.G. 85-168	3278 "M" Street, N.W. Astor Cleaners	Awning renovation

ACTION: Issue permit for renovations to existing awning. Lettering will be applied to valance as shown on drawing received and dated 29 May 1985.

O.G. 85-169	1262 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Fabrikant & Kain, Inc.	Sign-awning

ACTION: Issue permit for proposed plain black canvas awning with no lettering or other graphic elements. If business is to be identified on awning, submit separate application accurately depicting scale and design of proposed lettering or other elements.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 85-154	3641-51 Winfield Lane, N.W. Porten-Sullivan	New townhouses

ACTION: Issue permit for six townhouses as shown on working drawings & landscape plans received and dated 14 June 1985.

O.G. 85-171	1424 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Yves M. Morillon	Sign

ACTION: Issue permit for sign as proposed in application received and dated 31 May 1985.

O.G. 85-172	3249 'O' Street, N.W. Gail Rogers	Garage demolition

ACTION: Issue permit for demolition of existing metal garage structure facing alley. Building does not contribute to the historic district.

O.G. 85-173	3251 Prospect Street, N.W. Phoenix-Georgetown, Inc.	Banner signs

ACTION: Withdrawn by applicant.

O.G. 85-174	3251 Prospect Street, N.W. Phoenix-Georgetown, Inc.	Window & awning signs

ACTION: Issue permit for sign on awning valance and silk-screened signs at window glass as proposed.

O.G. 85-177	3061 'M' Street, N.W. Loberts	Existing sign

ACTION: Issue permit for existing sign. Future signs in this location will conform to character of historic district.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 85-178	3401 'R' Street, N.W. Ann Nodell	Rear deck

ACTION: Issue permit for rear deck provided that brick be substituted for concrete block as proposed.

O.G. 85-179	1624 33rd Street, N.W. Gaile McCarty, M.D.	Porch conversion

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Design of addition is inappropriate to the existing house and context of historic district. Recommend submission of new design in character with the existing conditions; consideration should be given to utilizing original windows and doors.

O.G. 85-180	1063 31st Street, N.W. Suburban Shade & Awning	Awnings

ACTION: Issue permit for proposed awnings and sign as shown on drawing received and dated 13 June 1985. Recommend removal of any existing signs or lettering on front of building.

O.G. 85-181	3287½ 'M' Street, N.W. Suburban Shade & Awning	Awning renovation

ACTION: Issue permit to recover existing awning. Recommend letters not to exceed 6" in height and a choice of canvas color matching that of the neighboring business to the west.

O.G. 85-182	3631 & 3633 'M' Street, N.W. Patricia Stefan Moore	Multi-unit residential

ACTION: Issue permit for proposed multi-unit residential structure. No objection to revision to penthouse and choice of tan-colored brick. Recommend erection of brick sample panel on site for approval of Commission prior to construction.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 85-184	3110 'M' Street, N.W. Richard D. Bernstein	Commercial alteration: Concept

ACTION: No objection to concept of enclosing space by filling in existing openings with glazing. Recommend careful study to match character of building.

O.G. 85-185	34th & K Streets, N.W. Hadid Investment Group, Inc.	New office building: Concept

ACTION: Withdrawn by request of applicant.

O.G. 85-190	3251 Prospect Street, N.W. Phoenix-Georgetown, Inc.	Plaque

ACTION: Issue permit for proposed plaque. Applicant has agreed to limit sign to marble having gilt-lined incised letters.

O.G. 85-191	3251 Prospect Street, N.W. Phoenix-Georgetown, Inc.	Banners

ACTION: Issue permit for the two central banners only. Applicant has agreed to eliminate all lettering but retain graphic elements.

O.G. 85-192	1517 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Matinque	Storefront & awning

ACTION: No objection to design of alterations to existing storefront. Recommend submittal of separate application for awning and signs. Recommend against back-lighting. Awning shape should be uniform shed style.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 85-31	232 2nd Street, S.E. Mr. & Mrs. Ned B. Ballengee	Addition and renovation

ACTION: No objection to concept of enclosure of existing rear porch. Recommend submission of accurate drawings showing proposed renovations for final action review.

---

*S.L. 85-48	1425 4th Street, S.W. Riverside Condominium, Assn.	Satellite antennas

ACTION: Do not issue permit. (See letter to Lenwood Graham, dated 24 May 1985).

---

*S.L. 85-52	800 17th Street, N.W. Riggs National Bank	Renovations

ACTION: Issue permit for renovations to ground floor and public sidewalk as shown on drawings received and dated 22 April 1985.

S.L. 85-55	501 13th Street, N.W. 13th & E Associates	Commercial alterations to E Street elevation

ACTION: No objection to the removal of existing entrance hood-awning and sign. Recommend against installation of second window to match existing 8'-0" by 4'-4" window which is not compatible with landmark building. Suggest restoration of building wall surface and submission of new design for show-windows and restaurant entrance of a scale and character compatible with building as a whole.

S.L. 85-56	800 17th Street, N.W. Riggs National Bank	Window alteration

ACTION: Issue permit for 11th floor alterations as shown.

S.L. 85-58	400 12th Street, S.W. McLachlen National Bank	Alterations

ACTION: Issue permit for alterations as shown on drawings received and dated 17 May 1985.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 85-59	2215 'N' Street, N.W. J. Asterbadi	Demolition

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit.

S.L. 85-60	1730 Crestwood Drive, N.W. Bruce & Shellen Keiner	Garage addition and alterations

ACTION: Issue permit for garage addition and alterations as shown on drawings received and dated 31 May 1985.

S.L. 85-61	501 13th Street, N.W. J.A. Weinberg	Temporary leasing sign

ACTION: No objection to placing proposed temporary leasing sign above entrance door at intersection until January 1, 1986.

S.L. 85-62	2029 Allen Place, N.W. Jim Haynes	Renovations

ACTION: Issue permit for renovations as shown on drawings received and dated 13 June 1985.

S.L. 85-63	1445 New York Avenue, N.W. NS & T Bank	Sign

ACTION: Issue permit.

S.L. 85-67	2700 Virginia Avenue, N.W. Watergate West	Retaining wall

ACTION: Issue permit to rebuild damaged retaining wall.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 85-68	209 Third Street, S.E. Richard & Mary Weirich	Wood deck & railing

ACTION: Issue permit for wood deck and 36 inch railing as proposed for roof of two story rear wing. Applicant has agreed to paint the railing to match the house trim or a neutral color such as gray or tan.

S.L. 85-74	726 17th Street, N.W. Theodore James Pedes	Temporary ATM machine

ACTION: Issue permit for temporary installation of proposed ATM machine to be removed 1 January 1986. Request separate application for awning replacement. Submit sample of material and indicate any signs.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

28 June 1985

The meeting was convened at 10:15 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts offices at 708 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.

Members present:	Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman Hon. John S. Chase Hon. Frederick E. Hart Hon. Sondra G. Myers Hon. Alan R. Novak Hon. Edward D. Stone, Jr.
Staff present:	Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary Mr. Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary Mr. Jeffrey R. Carson Mrs. Sue Kohler
National Capital Planning Commission staff present:	Mr. Donald Jackson
D. C. Historic Preservation Review Board staff present:	Mrs. Tanya Beauchamp

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Minutes of the 15 May 1985 meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, approved.

B. Dates of next meetings, approved as: 31 July 1985, Wednesday
11 September 1985, Wednesday

C. Publication of Brief History, 1984 edition, report. The Secretary reported that the new edition of the Commission's Brief History had just been received, and the Chairman expressed the Commission's thanks to Mrs. Kohler for her work on the project.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. U. S. Holocaust Memorial Council and Department of the Interior CFA 28/JUN/85-1, U. S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, between 14th and 15th Streets, south of the Main Auditors Building; revised designs. The Assistant Secretary introduced this project, saying that the new drawings and model represented an attempt to accommodate the points made previously by the Commission on both urban and building design aspects. He showed slides of the site in the process of being cleared, and of the old model and renderings. He said the revised design was smaller, lower, and set back farther from 15th Street. Mr. Albert Abramson from the Holocaust Memorial Council was then introduced. He said the Council and its architect had responded to the Commission's suggestions, which he considered helpful, and then he introduced the architect, George Notter, to explain the changes that had been made.

Mr. Notter said there were now two pavilions linked by a glass lobby. The building had been moved back from 15th Street to line up with the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and the 15th Street pavilion, housing the Hall of Remembrance with a two floor library above, had been considerably reduced in height. The cornice line would be the same as the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and the top of the Hall of Remembrance would line up with the Auditors Building Annex. The rear pavilion had not been reduced in height; it would accommodate three floors of exhibition space and other non-memorial functions. Conference areas, cafeteria, auditorium and garage would remain below ground. Above ground square footage would be roughtly 140,000-150,000. Mr. Notter said the color of the granite would be softer in tone than the Auditors Building and a different texture would be used. Turning to the landscaping, he said there would be a bosque of trees in front of the building, on 15th Street, and planting would be carried back under the Hall of Remembrance into the memorial plaza. Children's drawings from one of the camps would be translated into ceramic tiles and used in the garden, and there would also be sculpture in this area.

Mr. Notter then noted that there were some questions about property lines that had not been resolved, and the Assistant Secretary called on Jack Finberg from GSA to explain this. Mr. Finberg said there was still a small building belonging to GSA on the property, and there was a problem with the museum needing loading space where GSA now has a parking area. He said he thought these problems would be resolved with some property and parking rights exchanges.

In response to a question from Mr. Chase about visitor seating outside the building, Mr. Notter said there would be places in the garden and plaza areas. The members then looked at the model and Mr. Notter responded to their questions.

The landscaping was discussed next, by Pat Fox from EDAW. The Chairman said he preferred earlier plans that had shown a heavier stand of trees at the 15th Street entrance; he thought the current plans too fussy. Ms. Fox said the trees had been thinned because it was thought they were too dense and would make the plaza dark. She pointed out a small garden area to the north where there would be a heavier grouping of trees. Mr. Notter commented that the views of the memorial from the Mall and the Washington Monument grounds would be filtered through trees, if this landscaping plan were carried out. Mr. Stone was critical of the landscaping; he thought it was becoming too domestic in character. He said he would prefer a simple bosque and seating. He said he was also concerned about the proposal to use relief sculpture on the exterior of the Hall of Remembrance; he said he had never seen this done successfully and he thought an incised design might work out better. He added that he still found the 14th Street facade too aggressive and foreboding. Mr. Novak agreed, adding that the architect had probably not had time to address this; Mr. Notter concurred. The Chairman added that the 14th Street facade was very important as it would actually be the front door; most people would enter there. He said he thought the design was going in the right direction but could still go farther; he thought the open space in particular needed work.

Mr. Chase was concerned about the role that the architecture would play in this memorial--would it refine emotions or act as a neutral backdrop? He made a comparison with the Lincoln Memorial, where the visitor is made to feel the greatness of Lincoln, not the evil of John Wilkes Booth. He said he thought visitors to this memorial needed to feel love and understanding. Mr. Abramson responded that although the building will not be just a memorial, the Council wanted it to have an emotional quality, and they thought that it did. He said the Council did not want the memorial to be a place of terror, and he thought that feelings of love and understanding could best be brought out inside the building.

Mr. Hart agreed that the 14th Street facade was still too aggressive in character, but he said he liked the "fussy" garden as it offered more opportunities for sculpture. He also liked the idea of bringing the green of the garden into the courtyard area. Mrs. Myers said she wanted still more simplicity in the design, and she liked the idea of using an incised design on the Hall of Remembrance rather than relief sculpture.

The Chairman summarized the comments by saying that there was general agreement that the 15th Street facade was much improved--the apparent cornice height had been respected, the roof battered back, and the arcade that replaced the original columns had given the building a more friendly look. He said the 14th Street facade needed more study and suggested that the top row of windows might be set back; the cornice lines would then line up on this facade, too. He said the design was on the right track, and he thought that was all the Commission could say at this point. He made a final comment on the use of the children's drawings: He said he

had seen these drawings in Prague and they were very small; he thought perhaps they should be inside, and he was not sure that translating them into another medium would work. Mr. Abramson said he had considered asking the Czech government to donate some of the drawings to the museum for display, and he would pursue that idea. Exhibit A

B. National Park Service, Department of the Interior

CFA 28/JUN/85-2, Georgetown Waterfront Park, Phase I, between the Potomac River and K Street and Wisconsin Avenue and 31st Street, N.W., final working drawings and landscape plans. Staff member Jeffrey Carson recalled that the Commission had seen the preliminary plans for this park in April and said this submission was for final drawings and paving and street furniture details. He said the Planning Commission had just seen the plans and approved them. John Parsons, representing the Park Service said the plans had not changed and the working drawings were now 60% complete. The Assistant Secretary said the Georgetown Board had also reviewed the plans and had no objection to them. He added that he had represented the Commission at the hearing on 4 June at which the transfer of the land on which the park will be built (from the District to the Park Service) was discussed. He said the process was moving along rapidly, and in answer to a question from the Chairman, said he expected the transfer to occur very soon. Mr. Parsons said there was a letter in the mail.

Michael Vergason from EDAW, landscape architects, then discussed the plans and answered questions. Mr. Stone asked about the kinds of trees to be used; Mr. Vergason said there would be lindens along the waterfront, gingkos on K Street, and plane trees along 31st Street. He talked about the paving next, pointing out a paved area along the waterfront that would vary in width from 18 to 28 feet and would consist of either a pressed concrete brick paver or a bituminous concrete pavement with a chip and seal surface. Behind that would be a continuous planting trough with trees and park benches. Paving here would be granite blocks with grass between them. The members all agreed that they would prefer the pavers to the bituminous pavement, and the Chairman and Mr. Stone questioned the need for such a wide strip of pavement along the waterfront. Mr. Vergason said the perspective in the photograph with the paving drawn in was misleading, and he did not think the impression would be one of a vast paved area. He noted that there would be a variety of planting, including perennial beds and shrubbery, behind the waterfront promenade, as well as paths through the park area. Other than the reservations about the amount of paving, the members were pleased with the final drawings and unanimously approved them. Exhibit B

C. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

CFA 28/JUN/85-4, "Lone Sailor" at the Navy Memorial, Pennsylvania Avenue at 8th Street, N. W. Staff member Sue Kohler showed a drawing of

the Navy memorial and pointed out the proposed location of this statue, on the circular plaza, or disc, in the Pacific Ocean section of the incised world map. She noted that there would be other pieces of free-standing sculpture--in the pools along Pennsylvania Avenue--as well as bronze bas-relief panels around the disc. She introduced James Rich from PADC to tell the members that the PADC design committee and board had approved the maquette for further development, and to introduce Admiral William Thompson from the Navy Memorial Committee.

Admiral Thompson said the sculpture was intended to embody all the officers and enlisted men who had served in the Navy during the 210 years of its existence. An enlisted man was chosen for the statue because these men comprise 90% of all those who have served, and because the uniform has remained unchanged and is, in fact, similar to sailor's uniforms all over the world. Admiral Thompson noted at this point that the memorial is not intended to be a war memorial, but is to honor all the people of the Navy. He said there was no symbolism intended in the placement of the figure in the Pacific Ocean area of the map; it had seemed appropriate to place it in one of the water areas, and in this location it would not conflict with any other elements of the memorial. He said there would be no base for the sculpture, but to keep it from appearing as "a spirit rising from the water", a seabag and mooring cleat would be added; these elements would also indicate that the sailor has mobility and goes where his country sends him. Admiral Thompson noted that the sculptor, Stanley Bleifeld, had worked from photographs of a model standing in the wind, to give the feeling of being at the ocean's edge or on shipboard. The figure would be 7-7½ feet in height, and if approved, the sculptor would make a full-sized model.

The Chairman and Mr. Chase asked about the other sculptural elements in the memorial. Admiral Thompson said there would be 26 bas reliefs around the central disc, depicting events from naval history, various divisions of the Navy, and the racial and ethnic groups that had made contributions. One of the free-standing groups would be dedicated to foreign navies that had aided the United States; the other would depict the modern U. S. Navy.

The Chairman was concerned about the placement of the seabag and cleat; he said he would like the Commission or the staff to see how this would be done. Mrs. Myers was bothered by the possible "water walking" effect; the Chairman agreed this could be a problem and thought perhaps all three elements of the sculpture could be placed on a low, or flush bronze base. Mr. Chase asked when the Commission could expect to see the other sculpture; Admiral Thompson said he expected it would be ready within a year. The Chairman said he thought the sculptural program was a good one because it allowed a single statue, such as this one, to be very specific, while at the same time providing ways to honor the many other people, and the events, that have made up the Navy's history. The

concept of the "Lone Sailor" statue, to be cast ultimately in bronze, was unanimously approved. Exhibit C

D. Department of the Army

1. CFA 28/JUN/85-5, Administrative Building, Fort Myer, Virginia. Mr. Carson pointed out the site for this building, noting that both this and the next submission would be located outside the Fort Myer Historic District. He introduced Mr. Jackson from CHK Architects to disucss the project. Mr. Jackson said the building would be on an eleven acre site, sloping to the southwest, and would contain personnel and finance offices as well as a welcome center, which had been distinguished from the offices by placing it in a separate wing. The office section would be two stories high, the welcome center one story. He showed photographs of the site and drawings of a red brick building with a pale green hip roof and light-colored precast trim; he said it would harmonize with other buildings in the area. There were no objections to the design and it was unanimously approved. Exhibit D

2. CFA 28/JUN/85-6, Bowling Center, Fort Myer, Arlington, Virginia. Mr. Carson introduced Rick LeBlanc and Herb Eichler from Benatek Associates, architects, who showed drawings of a red brick, essentially windowless building. There were no objections to the design, but Mr. Stone asked that adequate planting be used around it to relieve the severity, and the Chairman suggested that on the largest of the blank walls a climbing plant, perhaps pyracantha, might be used. Exhibit D

E. District of Columbia Government, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

Old Georgetown Act

1. O.G. 85-162, 2809 P Street, N.W., proposed new dwelling, final working drawings. This project was withdrawn from the agenda. The Assistant Secretary noted, however, that on 18 June the Georgetown Board had disapproved the same design disapproved previously by the Commission and had requested further study. He said a report had been written for the record and was in the members' folders.

2. O.G. 85-166, 1000 29th Street, N.W., proposed new apartment building, revised concept designs. Mr. Carson recalled that the Commission had recommended additional design study for this project. He said the Georgetown Board had reviewed it on 18 June and had recommended continuing design development along the lines of the drawing they had seen. Mr. Carson showed the members this drawing and introduced Mr. Schwinn, the architect, to discuss the changes. Mr. Schwinn said the roof line had been raised in response to the Georgetown Board's recommendations, although he preferred it as it was originally; then he pointed out other changes--a different fenestration pattern and the addition of stringcourses and a rusticated base.

Mr. Stone asked if there had been an attempt to coordinate the roofing and other materials with the adjacent building by Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, and Mr. Schwinn said that there had been. He added that the material of the tower had been changed from glass to metal. Mr Schwinn then asked what his next step should be. He was asked to work on the development of the details and told that he could do that in conjunction with the development of working drawings.

3. O.G. 85-186 & 187, 3222-3270 M Street, N.W., Georgetown Park Phase II, final working drawings and material samples.

4. O.G. 85-188, 3276 M Street, N.W. Market building renovation, final working drawings.

As these two submissions were related, they were discussed at the same time. The Assistant Secretary said the Georgetown Board had given their approval to the final working drawings and materials for the new extension to Georgetown Park, but in the case of the Market House drawings, wanted to withhold approval pending further study of the canopy on the west side, where there was a problem with the overhang. He said the architects had been working on this since the Georgetown Board meeting and would show the Commission, in an informal submission, their proposals.

Milo Meacham from Skidmore, Owings & Merrill was then introduced. He said the difficulty arose from the fact that the program had been changed for the west side of the market; when the access road for the garage had been placed in that location it no longer seemed a suitable place for an outdoor market, so that function had been moved to the east side. Then it was discovered that large trucks using the access road could not clear the curving end of the canopy. The Board had recommended cutting off this curved section on the west side only, and Mr. Meacham showed drawings of this solution, which was not enthusiastically received. The Chairman said that since large truck use was infrequent the trucks could perhaps be allowed to use the other lane while normal traffic was held up briefly. Mr. Meacham said he did not think the city would allow that. The Chairman said that although symmetry was very important for this building, it might look better just to leave the canopy off on the west side rather than adulterate it. This would have the advantage of not obstructing the architecture of the facade. Mr. Hyman Myers, the restoration architect, said that he would have no problem with that solution. He added, for the record, that the architects had been very cooperative in following all his recommendations for preservation of this historic building. It was agreed by all that removing the west canopy was the best course to follow, especially because it would allow the whole facade to be seen, and this was the recommendation given to Mr. Meacham for his next submission to the Georgetown Board.

Scott Stinson, from Stinson-Capelli, discussed the material samples for the new addition to Georgetown Park and pointed out on the drawings

where each would be used. He said the basic brick would be dark red and a sample would be erected; he was uncertain at this point of the mortar color. The water table and banding would be of natural light stone and the roof of copper, chemically treated to turn green in a short time. There were no objections, and the drawings and materials were unanimously approved.

5. O.G. 85-197, 907 & 909 30th Street, N. W., Rosewood Hotel and office building, final working drawings. This item was withdrawn from the agenda.

Appendix I, approved.

Shipstead-Luce Act

1. S.L. 85-65, 3004 Oregon Knolls Drive, N. W., proposed new dwelling.

2. S.L. 85-66, 3027 Oregon Knolls Drive, N.W., proposed new dwelling.

Mr. Carson said this was the third in a series of houses in this area, overlooking Rock Creek Park. The first group was contemporary in style--brick with mansard roofs. The second group was vernacular, with wood siding and gable roofs. He showed slides of the houses already built and those going up (approved in 1984 by the Commission). Then he showed drawings of the two new houses, characterized by 8 inch wood lap siding and wrap around porches. He noted that the clapboard-covered chimneys, objected to earlier by the staff, had been changed to brick where they were prominent. The Secretary pointed out that one of the houses had been unacceptable to the staff because of the use of two kinds of roofs--hip and gable--making an awkward combination. It was recommended that only the gable form be used. The members agreed with the recommendations of the staff, and Mr. Stone made a strong recommendation that as many trees as possible be kept. The developer said he would do this, although he added that backfilling had already killed many of the trees on the site. The design of the houses was approved, providing drawings incorporating the staff's recommendations were received and found satisfactory.

3. S.L. 85-70, 425 2nd Street, N. E., new office building, concept. The Assistant Secretary said that this three story building to be erected for the National Republican Senatorial Committee, would be built on a site near the Capitol enclave. There is a small building on the site now, which was not approved by the Commission, which will be demolished. Richard Giegengack from Skidmore, Owings & Merrill was introduced to discuss the design. He said the Architect of the Capitol, neighbors and all interested parties had been consulted before serious design studies were made. He showed the members elevation drawings: the front elevation on 2nd Street, and the E Street, garden, and alley

elevations. He said the building would be light limestone or brick with a rusticated base, noting that there is an approved palette of colors for the Capitol interest district. He said the canopy had originally been designed in metal and glass, but it looked too much like an apartment and so had been changed to an elliptical stone form. The Chairman said he found this too heavy in appearance. Mr. Giegengack said the height would be 46 feet plus the penthouse and the "architectural embellishment" over the front entrance. Mr. Stone asked if the penthouse could be recessed somewhat; Mr. Giegengack said he thought that was possible, but that as designed, it tended to act as a classical attic rather than appear as a penthouse. The concept of the building was unanimously approved, with design development to be seen later.

4. S.L. 85-72, 2929 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W., renovations and addition, concept. Mr. Carson recalled that this house had been documented in the Commission's Massachusetts Avenue Architecture, Volume 2, and that it had been the residence of Gladys Vanderbilt Szechenyi; he noted that it had always been used as a private residence. George Hartman, architect from Hartman/Cox, was introduced. He said the building had been vacant for twelve years; water damage had destroyed most of the interior and the rear portico had collapsed. He said his plans for the exterior were to add an addition where the protico had been, demolish one small section near the ballroom, move a brick garden wall forward slightly to enlarge the parking courtyard, and make minor adjustments to the radius of the front driveway. Other changes would include the removal of irregular windows in the back and their replacement with windows of a regular pattern, the replacement of the doublehung windows in the ballroom with French doors, and the addition of a skylight in the ballroom. There would also be new landscaping throughout the property. At this point Mr. Hartman said he needed approval to demolish the small section near the ballroom and what remained of the old portico area, and approval for the addition. This addition would house a service kitchen and would connect to the ballroom. There were no objections and the concept of the renovations and additions, as well as the demolition, was approved.

Appendix II, approved.

F. Committee on House Administration, House of Representatives

1. CFA 28/JUN/85-7, H. J. Res. 142, a bill "To authorize the Black Revoluntionary War Patriots Foundation to establish a monument in the District of Columbia, at an appropriate site in Constitution Gardens". Mrs. Kohler read parts of this legislation, which followed the standard form with the exception of specifying the site. She said that since the last Commission meeting, comments had been requested for purposes of a hearing held 13 June. She said the Secretary had written a letter informing the House committee that the Commission would not meet until 28 June, but that he would like to state the continuing policy of not recommending memorial legislation in which a specific site is mentioned. Subsequently, the Commission's comments on NCPC's hearing

statement were requested by OMB. This agency's comments had also objected to the mention of a specific site. Again, the staff responded by saying that the Commission had not yet met, but as a matter of general policy would agree with the Planning Commission's statements. Now, Mrs. Kohler said, the Task Force on Memorials and Libraries of the Committee on House Administration would like the Commission to comment formally on the legislation. It was agreed by all that there would be no objection to such a monument, but there was unanimous objection to the mention of a specific site. Exhibit E

2. CFA 28/JUN/85-8, H.R. 2205, a bill "To erect a memorial on Federal land in the District of Columbia or its environs to honor members of the Armed Forces of the United States who served in the Korean War". Mrs. Kohler observed that this was the third time the Commission had reviewed legislation for this memorial. She said the first bill authorized the erection of a memorial to honor members of the Armed Forces of the United States who had fought in the war, and there was a National Committee for the Korean War Memorial involved for fund raising. The second bill included Allied as well as American soldiers in the memorial, and there was a provision for money to be appropriated from the Treasury if a site on private land were chosen; the Memorial Committee was still involved. The new legislation would go back to honoring only American servicemen and the entire cost would be borne by the United States; the memorial committee would no longer be necessary. She said the legislation was standard, with the site being described only as "in the District of Columbia or its environs", and the site and design would require approval of the Commission of Fine Arts. Mrs. Kohler then noted, for information, that there would be a hearing on this bill on 10 July, and it was her understanding that at that time Representative Florio would ask for an amendment that would give the American Battle Monuments Commission, rather than the Department of the Interior, responsibility for erecting the memorial; it would also empower the Battle Monuments Commission to accept donations to help defray the cost. There were no objections to the new legislation in the form presented, and it was unanimously approved. Exhibit F

G. Department of the Treasury, U. S. Mint

1. CFA 28/JUN/85-9, Lady Bird Johnson medal. Mrs. Kohler introduced Barry Frere and George Schafer from the Mint to discuss this medal. A gold medal will be presented to Mrs. Johnson and a bronze version will be for sale. On the obverse was a portrait of Mrs. Johnson, selected by the family, and her name. On the reverse was a pastoral scene, taken from a photograph of the LBJ Ranch, and the words "Dedicated to Family, Humanity, Education, Beautification of America". The members had no objection to the obverse, although they noted that the lettering differed in style from that on the reverse and asked that it be the same on both sides. There was some concern about the pictorial style of the reverse and whether it would lend itself well to being translated into a sculptural

medium. It was decided to approve the concept of the reverse and let Mr. Hart see the plaster model and give his opinion before giving final approval. It was also thought that the word "Dedicated" should be changed to "Dedication", so that the inscription would seem to apply more clearly to Mrs. Johnson. Exhibit G

2. CFA 28/JUN/85-10, Vietnam Veterans National Medal. Mrs. Kohler recalled that the Commission had approved legislation for this medal and then had heard of the plans for a competition to choose the designer. She introduced Barry Frere from the Mint to discuss the competition and to show the winning designs. Mr. Frere said the legislation authorizing the medal had encouraged submissions by veterans, heraldic artists and any others interested, and that to comply, the Mint had sent out over 5000 press releases to the media and veterans groups, soliciting ideas and inviting competition entries. A panel was set up to judge the 784 entries received; it consisted of representatives from the Army's Institute of Heraldry, the National Sculpture Society, the Mint, and the Veterans Administration. Twenty-eight designs were selected, and these were shown to the major veterans organizations (and to the Secretary and Mrs. Kohler of the Commission staff); from this group three were shown to the Secretary of the Treasury. He picked two designs--one for the obverse, one for the reverse--which by coincidence were the ones most favored by the veterans groups.

Mr. Frere then showed these to the Commission. The obverse showed a wartime scene with servicemen leaving a helicopter; this was superimposed on a map of Vietnam. Around the edge were the words "Vietnam Veterans National Medal". The reverse had an inscription stating that the medal was struck in honor of those who served in Vietnam, and the date of the medal; below the inscription was an emblem with the Capitol dome, eagle and shield, and two flags.

The members were generally pleased with both designs. On the reverse it was noted that the word "insure" should be changed to "ensure", and Mr. Frere noted that the date was not correct. He added that the Mint had made some minor changes from the original design: the inscription had been made slightly smaller and moved up slightly so that the emblem could be made large enough to be legible at medal size. (The medal will be struck in both 1½ inch and 3 inch sizes.)

There was more concern about modifications the Mint had made to the obverse. The original design had shown the tail of the helicopter extending into the lettering around the edge. The modified design showed a more foreshortened view to avoid this, and the helicopter was tilted upward as well. Mr. Hart and the other members thought the changes had reduced the effectiveness of the design, and the Chairman said he did not object to the extension of the helicopter tail into the lettering area, if it could be worked out technically; in fact, he thought it added interest. Mr. Hart and Mr. Novak both thought the original design should not be tampered with without the artist's consent, with Mr. Novak adding that the jury and the veterans organizations had voted for one design and were getting another.

Mr. Hart then made some general comments about the competition. He said the lack of any monetary award or the right to make the model had discouraged many competent sculptors from entering; he thought this had been a mistake. Mr. Frere said, in regard to the models, that since the competition was open to anyone, and non-sculptors were encouraged to enter, they had thought it would be better for someone from the Mint, with technical experience, to make the models. The members all thought, however, that the Mint should at least work with the artist on the model of his design, even if it turned out that he was not capable of making it himself.

The Chairman said the Commission would approve the concept of both designs, obverse and reverse, and would expect to see them again in model form. Exhibit H

III INSPECTION

Holocaust Memorial. This inspection was not made.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:10 p.m.

Signed,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED · BY · CONGRESS · MAY · 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT A

July 24, 1985

Dear Mr. Secretary:

The Commission of Fine Arts met again on 28 June 1985 with representatives of the Holocaust Memorial Council to view their most recently revised designs.

I am happy to report that there has been some progress in meeting the concerns of the Commission. The overall scale has been reduced by more clearly defining the separate functions of museum and memorial as separate but linked masses. In particular, the latter element has been lowered in height and set back from 15th Street to form a better relationship with the Bureau of Engraving and Printing building on the south. In addition, the introduction of a forecourt featuring a bosque of trees in the foreground, and the use of an arcaded-pier system for the supporting structure of the side walls has softened the overall effect of what was felt to be the exaggerated forcefulness of the initial design. Unfortunately, these positive changes are more effective on the west side where the memorial element is located and not on the east where the museum will serve as the main entrance to the complex. This facade is still extremely severe and could benefit from a similar adjustment in character.

Despite these misgivings which continue to concern the Commission, we feel there has been sufficient improvement to the overall urban design questions to warrant conceptual approval of the present scheme. This action is taken, however, with the expectation that every effort will be made to address the remaining problems, including the overbearing character of 14th Street entrance, the entrance and side yard landscaping, and of course the questions that have been raised about the nature of the various sculptural and decorative elements that will eventually play a critical role in the function of the building as a memorial.

Finally, the Commission strongly urges that the various security measures which most probably will become a design requirement as plans develop be given early attention and not treated as an adjunct to the building at a later stage. Much of the quality of the design could be diminished were these elements to clash with the character of the memorial.

Our next meetings are scheduled for July 31st and September 11th, and we will be happy to review further studies at that time.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

The Honorable
Donald P. Hodel
Secretary
U.S. Department of the Interior
18th & C Streets, N.W.
Room 6151
Washington, D.C. 20240

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
ESTABLISHED · BY · CONGRESS · MAY · 17, 1910
708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

EXHIBIT B

July 24, 1985

Dear Jack:

On 28 June 1985, the Commission reviewed the final working drawings for the Georgetown Waterfront Park, Phase I, with Mr. Parsons, from the National Park Service, and Mr. Vergason, of EDAW. The submission had also been reviewed by the Georgetown Board and we concur with their finding that it conformed to the approved concept designs. Though the park design and plant selection are approved, we request on-site material samples for review and approval by the Commission.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Manus J. Fish
Director
National Park Service
National Capital Parks
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W. - Room 336
Washington, D.C. 20242

IE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
ESTABLISHED · BY · CONGRESS · MAY · 17, 1910
708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

EXHIBIT C

July 24, 1985

Dear Mr. Rich:

At its meeting on 28 June 1985 the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed a small maquette for the "Lone Sailor" statue in the Navy Memorial.

The members were pleased with the design in this form and gave it their preliminary approval, with the expectation that the Commission would continue to review the sculpture in its various stages, and that details of its placement on the plaza and the position of the accompanying mooring cleat and seabag would be reviewed when ready.

It was noted that there will be additional free-standing and relief sculpture in the memorial area that will portray famous naval actions, the work of the various divisions of the Navy, and the racial and ethnic groups that make up its personnel.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. James Rich
Director of Development
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation
Suite 1220 North
1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004-1703

[E COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
ESTABLISHED · BY · CONGRESS · MAY · 17, 1910
708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

EXHIBIT D

July 24, 1985

Dear Mr. McCormick:

On 28 June 1985, the Commission reviewed two projects for Fort Myer, Virginia, including a new Administrative Building by CHK Architects and a proposed Bowling Center by Benatec Associates.

Following a brief presentation by Mr. Jackson of CHK, the Commission commended the architects on the design for the Administrative Building and recommended in favor of its construction. Similarly, the Commission approved the design for the proposed Bowling Center. In discussing the plans with Mr. LeBlanc of Benatec, the Commission noted that most windowless buildings such as the Center often appear severe and recommended that extensive landscaping in the form of evergreens and ivy would help soften this potential effect.

The Commission is encouraged by the spirit of cooperation received from the Engineering Division and looks forward to working more closely with you on all future construction proposed for Federal properties in the District, Fort Myer, and the Pentagon area.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. William N. McCormick, Jr.
Chief, Engineering Division
Directorate of Engineering and Construction
Department of the Army
Office of the Chief of Engineers
Washington, D.C. 20314

E COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910
708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

EXHIBIT E

July 24, 1985

Dear Ms. Oakar:

At its meeting on 28 June 1985 the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed H.J. Res. 142, "To authorize the Black Revolutionary War Patriots Foundation to establish a memorial in the District of Columbia at an appropriate site in Constitution Gardens".

While there was no objection to the intent of this legislation, the Commission would like to reconfirm its continuing policy of not recommending memorial legislation in which a specific site is mentioned.

It was suggested that the wording be the same as for the Korean War Memorial legislation (H.R. 2205) in regard to a site: "...on Federal land in the District of Columbia or its environs...."

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report to the Congress from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Honorable Mary Rose Oakar, Chairwoman
Task Force on Libraries and Memorials
Committee on House Administration
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED · BY · CONGRESS · MAY · 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT F

July 24, 1985

Dear Ms. Oakar:

At its meeting on 28 June 1985 the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed H.R. 2205, authorizing the erection of a memorial to honor members of the armed forces of the United States who served in the Korean War.

There were no objections to either the intent or wording of this legislation.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report to the Congress from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Honorable Mary Rose Oakar, Chairwoman
Task Force on Libraries and Memorials
Committee on House Administration
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

HE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
ESTABLISHED · BY · CONGRESS · MAY · 17, 1910
708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

EXHIBIT G

July 24, 1985

Dear Mrs. Pope:

At its meeting on 28 June 1985 the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed designs for the Lady Bird Johnson Medal.

The obverse design was approved with the observation that the lettering differed in style from that on the reverse and the recommendation that it be the same on both sides.

In regard to the design for the reverse, there was some question as to whether the pictorial quality would be effective when translated into sculptural form. It was requested that Frederick Hart, the sculptor member of the Commission, see the clay model before final approval is given. It was also requested that the word "dedicated" be changed to "dedication".

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

The Honorable
Donna Pope
Director of the Mint
Department of the Treasury
U.S. Mint
Washington, D.C. 20220

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-566-1066

EXHIBIT H

July 24, 1985

Dear Mrs. Pope:

The Commission of Fine Arts reviewed designs for the Vietnam Veterans National Medal at its meeting on 28 June 1985.

We understand that these are the designs chosen by Secretary Baker from a group selected by the jury of the competition held for the design of this medal.

The Commission would have no objection to the design for the reverse or to the concept of the obverse design. However, it was felt that the modifications made by the Mint to the original obverse design reduced its effectiveness, and it was recommended that the artist be consulted before any modifications. The Commission would expect to see the modified design before giving final approval.

It was also pointed out that the word "insure" on the reverse should be changed to "ensure".

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

The Honorable
Donna Pope
Director of the Mint
Department of the Treasury
U.S. Mint
Washington, D.C. 20220

MEETING:

31 July 1985